DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 450 CE 026 665

AUTHOR Rose, Harold
TITLE An Evaluation of The Kentucky Development and Technical Assistance Community Education Project, as Part II of The National Community Education Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Kentucky State Dept. of Education, Frankfort.
SPONS AGENCY National Advisory Committee on Community Education, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 30 Jun 80
NOTE 32p.; Not available in paper copy due to light type. For related documents see CE 026 686-687.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Community Education; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Community Relationship; *Staff Development; *Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky; *Kentucky Development Tech Assist Community Ed Proj

ABSTRACT

An evaluation study examined the effectiveness of the training and technical assistance provided, amount and type of assistance provided, and results and benefits of a project to provide community education training and technical assistance in Kentucky. Result evaluation data were obtained from community education practitioners by a questionnaire. Process evaluation data were obtained from selected questionnaire data and from records and reports provided by State Department of Education (SDE) personnel. Findings indicated that the State Resource Network Team (SRNT) has generated significant training and technical assistance activity. The SDE was identified as the prime provider of help. Face-to-face consultation and workshops were the greatest utilized methods in providing training and technical assistance. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents evaluated help as being either very useful or useful. There appeared to be additional need and desire for continued community education support. Respondents also indicated that benefits resulting from community education have been positive and that communities reflected these benefits. Of twenty-six new districts, sixteen made steps toward providing community education-type activities. (The questionnaire is appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193450

An Evaluation of

The Kentucky Development and Technical Assistance Community Education Project

as Part II of

The National Community Education Evaluation

by

Harold Rose
Third-Party Evaluator

6-30-80

CE 026 685

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Sims

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	
INTRODUCTION	1
Goals and Objectives	1
Activities	2
Results and Benefits	3
METHODOLOGY	4
Sampling and Population	4
Instrumentation	4
Analysis	4
PRESENTATION OF DATA	5
Training and Technical Assistance	5
Future Assistance Desired	10
Support Services	10
Evaluation of Community Education Benefits	13
Advisory Member Evaluation of Group Effectiveness and Support Provided	14
Community Education Expansion	15
Project Activities: Process Evaluation	16
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
Summary and Conclusions	18
Recommendations	21
APPENDIX	23
Questionnaire	24

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Training and Technical Assistance Received by Community Educators by Source	6
2.	Training and Technical Assistance Received by Community Educators by Method	8
3.	Training and Technical Assistance Usefulness as Reported by Respondents	9
4.	Desire for Future Training and Technical Assistance as Reported by Respondents	10
5.	Support Services Usefulness as Reported by Respondents	11
6.	Desire for Future Support Services as Reported by Respondents	12
7.	Benefits Resulting From Community Education Involvement as Evaluated by Respondents	13
8.	Advisory Group Effectiveness and Support Provided as Evaluated by Group Members	14

INTRODUCTION

The Kentucky State Department of Education was funded during the 1979-80 year to provide community education training and technical assistance within the state. This evaluation study examined the effectiveness of the training and technical assistance provided, the amount and type of assistance provided, and the results and benefits of this effort.

Goals and Objectives

The State (Kentucky) Development and Technical Assistance Project proposed the following community education goals for the 1980 fiscal year:

1. To provide necessary development and technical assistance to local Education Agency (LEA) personnel that will result in Community Education (CE) programs being established in each of the 26 new districts.
2. To assist the advisory council members of the 14 established programs to become more effective advisory councils.
3. To develop a close working relationship among the local school districts.
4. To further develop a solid, supportive network of colleges and universities that are strategically located in regard to geography and who have a good working relationship with the local school districts in their general areas of the state.
5. To build upon the skills and knowledge of the personnel in Kentucky's six previously federally funded LEA's, and other fully functioning LEA's, and enlarge the State

Resource Network Team that will provide on-site assistance to those districts establishing new programs.

6. To develop a fully functioning State Advisory Council.

Activities

The primary approach taken to accomplish these objectives was continued utilization and support of the State Resource Network Team (SRNT). The SRNT is composed of selected individuals within the State Department of Education (SDE), LEA's and institutions of higher education (IHE). Specific activities, as detailed in the grant proposal, included the following:

1. Planning workshops for SRNT. Develop, consolidate, and coordinate plans for providing developmental and technical assistance to LEA.
2. Development workshop for the 26 project LEAs. Workshop follow-up will include on-site visits by SRNT members who will provide consulting assistance.
3. Advisory Council workshop for the 14 expanding districts. Follow-up will include on-site visits by SRNT members.
4. Statewide meeting, project LEAs, university associates (UAs), State Advisory Council, and Kentucky Community Education Association (KCEA). Present model programs, inservice activities, sessions for 26 LEAs establishing programs and council members from the 14 expanding programs. SRNT will provide consulting.
5. State Advisory Council will meet in November and April. Assessment of goals, objectives and strategies. Plans will be developed for the 1980-81 year.
6. The SRNT will meet and will include IHEs not presently involved. New members will be provided an orientation to CE and a joint planning session will be conducted.

Results and Benefits

The results and benefits as a result of the above activities were projected to be as follows:

1. Local advisory council members more knowledgeable and effective.
2. Greater appreciation for and understanding of both the problems and contributions of the school as these relate to the community.
3. State Advisory Council will provide both short-term and long-term direction for CE development in Kentucky.
4. Both process and program models will have been developed and refined for adaption and modeling by other districts.
5. Resource persons will be available to districts in every region and a CE model to meet idiosyncratic local needs will be easily accessible to each school district.
6. State-wide communication and support system for CE (LEA, IHE, State Department Agencies) will be strengthened.

The current evaluation examined both the process, or approach aspect, as well as results and benefits. Process evaluation compared activities detailed above to activities performed.

The results evaluation was accomplished primarily by means of a questionnaire administered to selected community education practitioners and community members.

METHODOLOGY

Result evaluation data were obtained from community education practitioners by a questionnaire. Process evaluation data were obtained from records and reports provided by the SDE personnel as well as selected data from the questionnaire.

Sampling and Population

The population for the study was school district personnel involved in or initiating community education programs as well as selected educators involved in community education activities such as state department of education personnel. The instrument was completed by personnel in attendance at a community education workshop held in May, 1980. Instruments were mailed to selected personnel in several school districts not represented at the workshop. Fifty-eight usable instruments were obtained.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire, Appendix, was designed to collect data concerning such aspects as: support received from the resources network, type and usefulness of support and delivery methods.

Analysis

Since the respondents were not randomly selected, no tests of statistical significance were employed. Rather, frequency distributions and percentages were computed to illustrate evaluation results.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Respondent responsibilities and positions included: 13 community education directors; 16 building coordinators or teachers; 21 advisory group members; 11 school administrators; 4 state department personnel; and 14 others such as community college and community services representatives. Several respondents filled multiple roles; therefore, the positions represented were greater than the number of respondents.

Forty of the fifty-eight respondents indicated their school district had a functioning community school program and that the mean years of existence was 5.18. The median years was 5.

Training and Technical Assistance

Providing training and technical assistance was a primary responsibility assumed by the project director. This responsibility was addressed by personnel within the State Department of Education, in particular the project director, and the SRNT which was established by the project director. This network was composed of participating institutions of education and local education agencies. Table 1 presents data on the type assistance received and the source. Information could be obtained from one or a combination of these sources; therefore, the number and percentage figures for source exceed the totals.

The frequency of support reported indicates that the resources network is viable and active. Within this sample, 477 cases of assistance were reported. The assistance areas examined were ordered by frequency of utilization in Table I. The assistance area most reported was that dealing with community councils, task forces and steering committees. The second and third most utilized assistance

Table 1

Training and Technical Assistance Received by Community Educators by Source

Assistance Received	Source: State Dept. of Educ. N	State Dept. of Educ. %	Local Educ. Agency N	Local Educ. Agency %	Inst. of Higher Educ. N	Inst. of Higher Educ. %	N
1. Developing Community Councils, Task Forces, Steering Committees, etc.	36	97	22	59	14	38	37
2. Designing programs based on a community needs assessment.	16	62	23	88	9	35	26
3. Drafting instruments for community needs assessment.	16	70	15	65	11	48	23
4. Designing public relations or advertising materials.	13	57	17	74	12	52	23
5. Designing programs for special populations (elderly, minorities, handicapped, etc.)	13	59	17	77	2	9	22
6. Analyzing local school or government policy or regulations relating to community education.	14	67	10	48	5	24	21
7. Writing proposals to fund community education.	12	63	14	74	8	42	19
8. Developing project management skills.	12	71	9	53	10	59	17
9. Analyzing data and writing reports on evaluations of community education projects.	9	56	7	44	5	31	16
10. Developing job descriptions and qualifications for CE employees.	11	73	9	60	5	33	15
11. Designing and drafting instruments for evaluations of community education projects.	12	80	12	80	6	40	15
12. Developing plans for school facility design or use of school facilities.	8	53	15	100	9	60	15
13. Identifying funding sources for CE.	8	57	6	43	7	50	14
14. Drafting school board or inter-agency joint resolutions.	9	75	5	42	4	33	12
TOTAL	189	40	181	38	107	22	477

areas were program design and needs assessment, respectively. The least utilized help was in drafting school board or interagency joint resolutions.

For total figures, the State Department of Education was reported as being the most utilized source at 40%. Local education agencies were a close second at 38% and institutions of higher education were least utilized at 22%. Examining individual assistance areas, it may be seen that in no case were IHEs the most utilized source; however, LEAs were reported as the most utilized source for five assistance areas and used equally as much as the State Department of Education in one case. The State Department of Education was the most used source in the balance of cases.

Table 2 shows data detailing the methods used in providing training and technical assistance. As with Table 1, respondents utilized multiple methods of getting information; therefore, the frequency and percentages exceed the total figures. A total of 540 instances of receiving help through the three methods were reported. Face-to-face consultation and workshops were used at a comparable rate, 37% and 38% respectively. Telephone consultation was least utilized at 25%. In no assistance area was telephone consultation the most utilized methods; however, in one case it was the second most utilized method, item 6. It is interesting to note that, in individual cases, workshops were reported as the most utilized method in five cases and used equally with face-to-face consultation in four cases. Face-to-face was the most highly used method in five instances. Thus, in individual cases as in the total, face-to-face and workshops were equally used.

Respondents were provided an opportunity to evaluate the usefulness of the assistance received. This was done on a three point scale ranging from very useful to not useful. Table 3 shows the result of that evaluation.

The majority of summary evaluation responses, 78%, were in the very

Table 2

Training and Technical Assistance Received by Community Educators by Method

Assistance Received	Method						
	Personal Face-to-Face Consul.		Tel. Consul.		Work-Shop		N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. Developing Community Councils, Task Forces, Steering Committees, etc.	24	65	20	54	36	97	37
2. Designing programs based on a community needs assessment.	23	88	15	58	23	88	26
3. Drafting instruments for community needs assessment.	21	91	12	52	18	78	23
4. Designing public relations or advertising materials.	17	74	9	39	17	74	23
5. Designing programs for special populations (elderly, minorities, handicapped, etc.)	16	73	6	27	20	91	22
6. Analyzing local school or government policy or regulations relating to community education.	14	67	13	62	1	5	21
7. Writing proposals to fund community education.	13	68	10	53	12	63	19
8. Developing project management skills.	13	76	7	41	17	100	17
9. Analyzing data and writing reports on evaluations of community education projects.	8	50	4	25	8	50	16
10. Developing job descriptions and qualifications for CE employees.	8	53	8	53	11	73	15
11. Designing and drafting instruments for evaluations of community education projects.	15	100	7	47	12	80	15
12. Developing plans for school facility design or use of school facilities.	12	80	10	76	12	80	15
13. Identifying funding sources for CE.	10	71	9	64	9	64	14
14. Drafting school board or inter-agency joint resolutions.	8	67	4	33	8	67	12
TOTAL	202	37	134	25	204	38	540

Table 3

Training and Technical Assistance Usefulness
as Reported by Respondents

Assistance Received	Usefulness						
	Very Useful		Useful		Not Useful		N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. Developing Community Councils, Task Forces, Steering Committees, etc.	27	73	10	27			37
2. Designing programs based on a community needs assessment.	16	64	8	32	1	4	25
3. Drafting instruments for community needs assessment.	16	70	7	30			23
4. Designing public relations or advertising materials.	16	64	9	36			23
5. Designing programs for special populations (elderly, minorities, handicapped, etc.)	14	70	5	25	1	5	20
6. Analyzing local school or government policy or regulations relating to community education.	11	65	6	35			17
7. Writing proposals to fund community education.	15	79	4	21			19
8. Developing project management skills.	13	13	2	13	1	6	16
9. Analyzing data and writing reports on evaluations of community education projects.	6	67	3	33			9
10. Developing job descriptions and qualifications for CE employees.	12	80	2	13	1	7	15
11. Designing and drafting instruments for evaluations of community education projects.	8	57	5	36	1	7	14
12. Developing plans for school facility design or use of school facilities.	8	62	4	31	1	7	13
13. Identifying funding sources for CE.	7	78	1	11	1	11	9
14. Drafting school board or interagency joint resolutions.	6	60	4	40			10
TOTAL	175	78	78	32	7	2	260

useful category and 30% were in the useful category. Only 2% were in the not useful category. This indicated that respondents found the assistance to be of benefit. The discrepancy between cases of receiving assistance and evaluation responses, 275 to 260 respectively, resulted from failure of some respondents to evaluate.

Future Assistance Desired

Respondents also were asked, Table 4, if future assistance was desired in these training and technical assistance areas. The total sample of 58 was employed to compute percentages since the respondent could desire help without having received it in the past. The percentage of respondents desiring help ranged from 31 to 16. By comparing Tables 1 and 4, the data indicate that the reported desire for future assistance is less than the currently reported use level. For example, in Table 1, 37 respondents indicated assistance had been obtained concerning item one; however, in Table 4 only 18 respondents indicated future need for assistance. In two cases, items 11 and 13, the future desire did exceed the reported use level.

Support Services

In addition to the direct training and technical assistance, the questionnaire solicited information concerning the support services contained in Table 5. Of the 58 respondents, approximately half utilized these support services. The support most utilized was resource persons to help with local needs and the least used was model community education programs. The usefulness of these support services was positively evaluated with all respondents judging them either very useful or useful. The majority indicated these were very useful.

Table 4

Desire for Future Training and Technical Assistance
as Reported by Respondents

Assistance Received	Desire Future Asst.	%of 58
1. Developing Community Councils, Task Forces, Steering Committees, etc.	18	31
2. Designing programs based on a community needs assessment.	18	31
3. Drafting instruments for community needs assessment.	17	29
4. Designing public relations or advertising materials.	13	22
5. Designing programs for special populations (elderly, minorities, handicapped, etc.)	15	26
6. Analyzing local school or government policy or regulations relating to community education.	10	17
7. Writing proposals to fund community education.	13	22
8. Developing project management skills.	14	24
9. Analyzing data and writing reports on evaluations of community education projects.	9	16
10. Developing job descriptions and qualifications for CE employees.	12	21
11. Designing and drafting instruments for evaluations of community education projects.	16	27
12. Developing plans for school facility design or use of school facilities.	10	17
13. Identifying funding sources for CE.	17	29
14. Drafting school board or interagency joint resolutions.	10	17
TOTAL	192	

Table 5

Support Services Usefulness as Reported by Respondents

Support Services	Usefulness						
	Very Useful		Useful		Not Useful		N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. Model or demonstration CE program(s)	18	75	6	25			24
2. Resource persons to assist you in dealing with local needs	27	79	7	21			34
3. Short-term and/or long-term direction for CE development	21	68	10	32			31
4. A network to improve communication with others involved in CE development	23	82	5	18			28
TOTAL	89	76	28	24			117

As with the training and technical assistance, respondents were asked to indicate future desire for this type support, Table 6. Of the 58 respondents, 34% wanted resource persons, 31% wanted direction for community education development, 28% wanted a communication network, and 24% wanted model community education programs.

Table 6

Desire for Future Support Services as Reported by Respondents

Support Services	Desire Future Support	% of 58
1. Model or demonstration CE program(s)	15	26
2. Resource persons to assist you in dealing with local needs	27	47
3. Short-term and/or long-term direction for CE development	33	57
4. A network to improve communication with others involved in CE development	27	47
TOTAL	102	

Evaluation of Community Education Benefits

The respondents from school districts with current or developing community education programs were requested to evaluate the benefits associated with community education activities. Examples of benefits were provided and the respondents indicated agreement or disagreement with these statements. Table 7 presents these benefit areas as well as respondent reactions. Collapsing the strongly agree and agree responses, Table 7 shows that 82% responded in the affirmative to these statements. Ten percent were neutral and 8% disagreed that these benefits were evident within the respective school districts. Therefore, most respondents felt benefits had resulted from community education activities. These benefits included increased awareness concerning the school's role, community member involvement, communication, and cooperative efforts.

Table 7

Benefits Resulting From Community Education Involvement
as Evaluated by Respondents

Benefits Received	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. there has developed an increased awareness among community members of my school district concerning the role of the school in solving community problems	27	68	7	18	3	7	3	7			40
2. community members of my school district have been involved in working with the schools to meet community needs	17	40	15	36	5	12	4	10	1	2	42
3. communication between the school and community has improved	19	46	13	32	6	15			3	7	41
4. cooperative program efforts between school personnel and other agency personnel have increased	20	50	15	38	3	8			2	4	40
TOTAL	83	51	50	31	17	10	7	4	6	4	163

Advisory Member Evaluation of Group Effectiveness and Support Provided

Advisory members responded to statements which related to perception of ability to perform as well as support services received. Table 8 shows that 21% strongly agreed with the statements. Thirty-seven percent agreed and only 3% were neutral. The statements related to the member's knowledge of role, adequacy of training and support provided, and effectiveness of the member's respective group in providing educational direction within the school district. Based on this data, the advisory members indicated positive assessment of these items.

Table 8

Advisory Group Effectiveness and Support Provided
as Evaluated by Group Members

Effectiveness and Support	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. I know what is expected of me as a community education advisory group member.	5	71	6	29							21
2. I feel the advisory group I belong to is effective in providing direction for educational programs within my school district.	11	52	9	43	1	5					21
3. Training and support services provided my advisory group have been adequate.	12	57	8	38	1	5					21
TOTAL	38	60	23	37	2	3					63

Community Education Expansion

A goal of the project was : To provide necessary development and technical assistance to LEA personnel that will result in CE programs being established in each of the 26 new districts. Data responding to the result, programs being established in each of the 26 new districts, was not available through the questionnaire. Therefore, the project director provided information concerning the CE status of these districts. Ten of the 26, 38%, have done nothing regarding CE development. The balance, 62%, have made varying steps toward CE establishment. None of the 16 have developed CE programs; however, 5 of the districts have selected persons to be responsible for coordinating CE type activities. These have usually been personnel with other responsibilities. Of these 16 districts, all have provided program activities and/or made facilities available to the community.

Of the 14 expanding districts, one has experiences financial difficulties and survival of the CE concept is questionable. One district has eliminated the CE process and retained only the program aspect. The balance remain relatively stable with some growth.

Project Activities: Process Evaluation

Activity 1: Planning workshops for SNRT

Two general meetings of the SNRT were held. An additional meeting was conducted at which prospective SNRT members were provided an orientation to CE and a joint planning meeting was held.

Activity 2: Development workshops for the 26 project LEAs

Two two-day training sessions were held for LEA coordinators.

Activity 3: Advisory council workshops for the 14 expanding districts

Fifteen training sessions were conducted for LEAs and community persons pertaining to the role and function of advisory councils.

Activity 4: Statewide meetings for project LEAs, UAs, State Advisory Council and KCEA

Two statewide meetings were held. One was held in the fall and the other during the spring. The fall meeting was in conjunction with KCEA.

Activity 5: State Advisory Council will meet in November and April

Three meetings of the council were held and task forces and committees were formed and are functioning.

Activity 6: The SNRT will meet and will include IHEs not presently involved

This meeting was held as mentioned above in response to Activity 1.

The above activities relate specifically to the project plan of activities. Below are outlined other support activities relating to CE functions.

1. Presentations were made by the project director at the KCEA conferences, at two teacher inservice programs and the Kentucky Health Association.
2. A monthly CE column has been written for the State Association Newsletter by the project director.
3. A CE survey was conducted by the project director and findings included the fact that within 148 local districts responding, 419 buildings are being made available to the public.
4. Legislation was introduced to financially support CE coordinator positions. This legislation passed one body and failed to get out of committee to be considered by the other. Hearings were conducted and this provided an opportunity for CE to be explained to the legislators.
5. Several IHEs provide graduate training in CE and 50 students enrolled in graduate level CE courses.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Conclusions

Significant training and technical assistance activity has been generated through the SRNT. This group consists of representatives from six IHEs, the six previously funded community education programs and other fully functioning CE programs, other selected persons committed to the development of CE, and the state project director. Of the 14 assistance areas investigated through the questionnaire, the SDE, LEAs, and IHEs provided some assistance in all areas. Despite the fact that the project director is the only person specifically identified to provide SDE assistance, the SDE was identified as the prime provider of help. LEAs were the second most identified provider and IHEs least.

Face-to-face consultation and workshops were the greatest utilized methods in providing training and technical assistance, at 37% and 38% respectively. Telephone consultation was used at a rate of 25% of the 540 instances reported.

Usefulness of training and technical assistance received was evaluated by the respondents. This evaluation was positive in that 98% indicated the help was either very useful or useful.

Therefore, the help being provided through the SRNT has been utilized to a significant degree and respondents have found it very useful.

Respondents were questioned about desire for future support in these assistance areas. The total respondent group, which included personnel not directly associated with CE programs, were included in this analysis. Responses indicated that the percentage range, over the 14 assistance areas, was 31 to 16 percent desire future assistance. Therefore, there appears to be additional need and desire for continued CE support.

Respondents indicated the benefits resulting from CE have been positive. The specific benefit areas examined were:

1. greater awareness among community members regarding the school's role in solving community problems;
2. involvement of community members in working with the schools to meet community needs;
3. improved communication between the school and community;
4. increased cooperative efforts between school personnel and other agency personnel.

Since these four broad benefit areas address the essence of CE and since the respondents indicated the communities represented reflected these benefits, it may be concluded that CE has been effective where established.

Advisory group improvement was a major objective of the project's training and technical assistance effort. Advisory group member respondents evaluated training and support services positively. Based on the responses, advisory members feel they know what is expected of them and that the advisory group was providing direction for the school district. Therefore, it seems the assistance provided advisory members was adequate to meet the needs.

The project proposal stated training and technical assistance would be provided which would result in 26 districts establishing CE programs. Based upon the extent of use and degree of usefulness of training and technical assistance, sufficient training and technical assistance may well have been available and/or provided. However, not all 26 districts established programs. It seems, to this writer, that given the current fiscal constraints in Kentucky school districts, the probability of any significant number of new programs being established is not great. Further, it seems that any progress, and there was considerable, toward school districts expanding non-traditional services to

the community is significant. Of the 26 districts, 16 or 62% did take action toward providing services which may not have been available in the past such as program activities and facilities. The CE process is not functioning within these 16 districts in that advisory councils are not formed and operating. However, the CE process usually comes about in stages and the first stage is simply offering of program activities. Perhaps next year or the year after a different report might be in order when these communities have had an opportunity to let the process develop.

Project activities as contained within the project proposal were evaluated. This evaluation revealed that the activities as planned were implemented. More activities were generated than were specifically detailed in the project proposal. An accounting of these activities may be seen in the chapter on data presentation.

The following points summarize the evaluation:

1. The SRNT has provided training and technical assistance to CE practitioners as well as to other interested personnel. Among these other interested personnel are state legislators who considered CE funding legislation.
2. The assistance provided CE practitioners as well as CE advisory members has been evaluated as useful.
3. The benefits resulting from CE in the expanding and developing districts were positively evaluated.
4. The proposed project activities, as well as additional ones, were implemented.
5. Of the 26 new districts, 16 made steps toward providing CE type activities. Of these 16, five districts named persons to coordinate these activities. The CE process was not established within any of these new districts.

6. Of the 14 expanding districts, one no longer has a CE program, one has eliminated the process and offers only program activities, and the balance are stable.
7. The State Advisory Council is functioning.

Recommendations

1. The SRNT appears to be the innovative feature of the CE thrust in Kentucky and, according to the data, has been effective in furthering the concept of CE. Therefore, it is recommended that the SRNT continue to be emphasized, expanded, and supported.

2. The State Advisory Council is a functioning body and should assume leadership for CE development. Therefore, it is recommended that this group, in cooperation with the project director, should coordinate the development of a comprehensive state plan for CE.

3. The reduction in State general funds and subsequent reduction in funds for education impacts significantly on the further development of CE. Therefore, additional effort should be made to gain support outside the current educational groups involved. Effort toward this end during the last year in regard to IHE, the Cooperative Extension Service, and community colleges are examples of this outreach type effort which should be expanded. Significant advances were made during the last year toward CE legislation and this effort should be continued.

4. According to the data collected, many school districts are interested in the CE concept; however, the financial situation prohibits many districts establishing full scale CE programs. The project director and SRNT have attempted to work with these districts toward the end of identifying and securing external funding. This work should be continued.

5. Further, these districts, where financial assistance has not been obtained, have been encouraged to initiate limited CE type functions. The idea seems to be that even if the district cannot hire a coordinator, establish councils, and provide a comprehensive program, the district can possibly make some facilities available or perhaps offer a few activities. In this manner the district is able to take steps toward establishing a CE program. It is recommended that this practice be continued for benefits are still available to the community through even these limited steps.

APPENDIX

COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM

LOCAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is a part of a study of Community Education Programs in Kentucky. The information you provide will help the State Department of Education plan for responding to Community Education needs.

This questionnaire deals with the training and technical assistance (T/TA) activities of the Community Education Program administered by the State Department of Education before and during the 1979-80 period. Its purpose is to inquire about the type and usefulness of T/TA you have received.

Thank you for your assistance.

IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

RESPONDENT NAME_____

SCHOOL DISTRICT OR AGENCY:_____COUNTY_____

I am a: (Check (✓) any that apply)

___ a. Local community education or community schools director

___ b. CE building coordinator

___ c. School board member

___ d. CE teacher/instructor

___ e. CE advisory group member

___ f. School administrator (specify:_____)

___ g. Staff member of a non-school local government or private agency

___ h. State education agency staff member (specify:_____)

___ i. Other state agency staff member (specify:_____)

___ j. Other (specify:_____)

I am currently (Check (✓) only one that applies to you):

___ a. Involved in a local community education program

___ b. Not involved in a local community education program

Does your school district have a functioning community school program?

___Yes ___No

If yes, how many years has this program been operating? ___years

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Please provide any other information about your involvement in community education which would help us to understand your situation:

_____

A. Please describe the training and/or technical assistance which you have received since July, 1970 by using the table below. Listed on the left side of the page are a number of content areas in which you might have received training and/or technical assistance. In column A, please check those content areas in which you have received training or assistance.

B. For those content areas which you checked in column A, please check in column B the source from which this assistance was obtained (1. State Department of Education, 2. Local Education Agency, 3. Institution of Higher Education). Check all sources that apply.

C. For those content areas which you checked in column A, please check in column C the means (1. personal face-to-face consultation, 2. telephone consultation, 3. training workshop) by which you received the assistance. Check all means that apply.

D. In column D (Usefulness), please indicate how useful you think the assistance you checked in A was for you. Check only one sub-column under C.

E. Please read through the list of content areas again, and indicate in column D those areas in which you would like training or technical assistance in the future. You may include in your responses additional content areas not covered in the given list. Items may be checked in E even though you did not check them in A.

	A.	B. Source - Check (✓) All That Apply			C. Means - Check (✓) All That Apply			D. Usefulness Check (✓) Only One			E.
	Rec'd. Asst.	1. State Dept. of Educ.	2. Local Educ. Agency	3. Inst. of Higher Educ.	4. Personal Face-to-Face Consul.	5. Tel. Consul.	6. Work-Shop	7. Very Useful	8. Useful	9. Not Useful	10. Desire Future Asst.
1. Developing Community Councils, Task Forces, Steering Committees, etc.											
2. Analyzing local school or government policy or regulations relating to community education.											
3. Drafting school board or interagency joint resolutions											
4. Drafting instruments for community needs assessment.											
5. Designing programs based on a community needs assessment.											
6. Writing proposals to fund community education											
7. Developing plans for school facility design or use of school facilities											
8. Designing programs for special populations (elderly, minorities, handicapped, etc.)											
9. Developing job descriptions and qualifications for CE employees.											
10. Designing and directing instruments for evaluations of community education projects.											
11. Analyzing data and writing reports on evaluations of community education projects.											
12. Designing public relations or advertising material.											
13. Developing project management skills.											
14. Identifying funding sources (e.g.											
15. Other (specify) _____											
16. Other (specify) _____											

SECTION B-OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES

A. In addition to training, technical assistance, and information dissemination, please indicate below what additional forms of support and assistance are available to you. On the left are a number of types of additional support which you might have available. Please check in column A those types of support which you have used. Please add at the bottom other forms of support apart from those previously mentioned.

B. For those forms of support which you checked in column A, please check to indicate the overall usefulness of the particular type of support (column B 1-3).

C. In column C, please check those areas of support which you would like to receive in the future. You may add to the list of given types of support.

	A.	B. Usefulness Check (✓) One			C.
	Support Rec'd	1. Very Useful	2. Useful	3. Not Useful	Desire Future Support
1. Model or demonstration CE program (s)	___	___	___	___	___
2. Resource persons to assist you in dealing with local needs	___	___	___	___	___
3. Short-term and/or long-term direction for CE development	___	___	___	___	___
4. A network to improve communication with others involved in CE development	___	___	___	___	___
5. Other (specify:_____ _____)	___	___	___	___	___
6. Other (specify:_____ _____)	___	___	___	___	___

SECTION C

Answer these only if your school district has, or is currently developing a functioning community education program.

For the statements below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number.

Strongly Agree (SA) 1, Agree (A) 2, Neutral (N) 3, Disagree (D) 4, Strongly Disagree (SD) 5

During the last year:	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. there has developed an increased awareness among community members of my school district concerning the role of the school in solving community problems.	1	2	3	4	5
2. community members of my school district have been involved in working with the schools to meet community needs.	1	2	3	4	5
3. communication between the school and community has improved.	1	2	3	4	5
4. cooperative program efforts between school personnel and other agency personnel have increased.	1	2	3	4	5

Answer only if you are a community education advisory group member.

5. I know what is expected of me as a community education advisory group member.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I feel the advisory group I belong to is effective in providing direction for educational programs within my school district.	1	2	3	4	5
7. training and support services provided my advisory group have been adequate.	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you very much for your assistance.